

19                   RODNEY McCULLUM: Thank you. As Paul mentioned,  
1 20 [I also represent the Nuclear Energy Industry here. I'm  
21 responsible for our view of the Repository SEIS. I want to  
22 start out by thanking the Department of Energy for  
23 providing this important opportunity for public debate on  
24 this.

25                   I want to join with Mayor Goodman in  
1 expressing my sincere appreciation for this. It's a  
2 fundamental important part of our Democratic process.  
3 I'm glad I came out here today. I'm proud to be an  
4 American, to see all these elected officials come out  
5 here, express their concerns, to see all the citizens  
6 out here to listen to these concerns.

7                   This is indeed why we have such a great  
8 country, because we have processes like this. This  
9 particular process is vitally important to America and  
10 vitally important, of course, to Las Vegas.

11                   It is important to Las Vegas for two reasons.  
12 One, because Yucca Mountain is, indeed, 90 miles north  
13 of here. Two, because no city is more interested, I  
14 would say, in affordable, reliable, safe, dependable  
15 forms of electricity than the place where the lights  
16 burn the brightest and the air conditioners work the  
17 hardest as here in Las Vegas.

18                   As Paul has mentioned, nuclear energy supplies  
19 20 percent of our electricity. We do so without  
20 contributing to climate change, without polluting the  
21 air. We safely contain all of our wastes. We manage

22 these wastes.

23           Yucca Mountain is only one small part of an  
24 entire integrated approach to managing used nuclear  
25 fuel. All of the used nuclear fuel generated over 40  
1 years of operating over 100 reactors stacked on top of  
2 itself would fit on a single football field less than 10  
3 yards deep.

4           We manage it by safely storing it in dry casks  
5 on site. We manage it in pools. We safely transport it  
6 as Paul mentioned. We may be moving to interim storage  
7 facilities while we're waiting for this process to  
8 continue out here at Yucca Mountain.

9           We also are looking at recycling technologies  
10 which can move the harmful ingredients in the used  
11 nuclear fuel. The document that DOE has provided is  
12 important fodder for the public debate that is now  
13 ongoing.

14           We see -- I would say in a word, I would  
15 characterize the Repository Draft Supplemental EIS --  
16 obviously we'll have a lot of specific comments on it --  
17 one word: improvements. DOE didn't have to do this.  
18 DOE could have stood on the EIS that was released in  
19 2002 and gone into the licensing process, but a lot's  
20 happened since 2002.

21           We have improved analytical techniques. Look  
22 how your computers and all the gadgets you have in your  
23 pocket have advanced. Those gadgets have been advanced.  
24 Those tools, we have improved analytical tools for  
25 looking at repository safety as well. We have improved

1 the design of Yucca Mountain.

2 The nuclear industry very much endorses the  
3 simplification in surface facility handling that has  
4 been facilitated by this TAD concept. Folks should read  
5 this document. That's important in Nevada, because the  
6 simplification is good for the folks who will work in  
7 Nevada and employees of our member companies out at the  
8 site.

9 We endorse the TADs, and we feel we can load  
10 them at our sites as safely as we load the existing  
11 canisters today. We look at the improvements of the  
12 analytical capabilities. We see that this repository is  
13 now projected for the next million years to produce  
14 radiation exposure to a person living on the  
15 Yucca Mountain site drinking nothing but that ground  
16 water for an entire year will receive about -- mean peak  
17 doses of 2.3 millirems.

18 That's less radiation than I received to fly  
19 out here to be with you here today from Washington, D.C.  
20 You know what? You might be saying, well, can you  
21 predict a million years in the future? If you said  
22 that, I would say you were pretty smart.

23 I would say that the Department of Energy has  
24 been conservative. I would say that's a gross  
25 overestimation of what the radiological consequences in  
1 the future will be. There's a natural reactor that  
2 occurred in the ground in Oklo in Africa that produced  
3 some of the same radioisotopes over a billion years ago.

4 Those isotopes are still there and doesn't have the  
5 protections that will be designed in Yucca Mountain.

6 If you don't -- our comments, we will be  
7 introducing our own independent scientific studies that  
8 indicate why we think that's conservative, why we think  
9 DOE has overestimated, if anything, the consequences of  
10 Yucca Mountain. But even if you don't believe that, and  
11 I don't believe you should, because we are the nuclear  
12 industry, this Democratic process is so important, is  
13 designed to continue and is designed to go into a  
14 licensing process for fair, objective, and independent  
15 review of this. Believe me, I've been through some of  
16 these processes, and these are very rigorous processes.

17 A lot of concerns have been aired here today.  
18 Those concerns go into the licensing process. I  
19 encourage you folks to take the same level of  
20 participation you brought out here tonight, bring that  
21 into the licensing process, and let's find out once and  
22 for all what the truth about Yucca Mountain and its  
23 safety is.

24 Let's complete this democratic process the way  
25 it was laid out by our several congresses and several  
1 elected presidents, and let's find out the answers and  
2 get on with it for the sake of America. We need this  
3 energy, and we need to continue to manage this material.]

4 Thank you.